

**REMARKS**

Claim 4 is canceled herein. Claims 1-3 and 5-20 now remain pending in the application.

**Allowability of Claims 8-20**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indicating that claims 8-10 are allowed.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 3-7 and 11-20 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 11 and 16 are amended herein to correct for any 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections. Claim 4 is canceled herein, with claim 1 amended herein to incorporate limitation from now canceled claim 4. The Applicants respectfully request an indication that claims 3, 5-7 and 11-20 are now allowed.

**35 USC 112 Second Paragraph Rejection of Claims 11-20**

The Office Action rejected claims 11-20 as allegedly being indefinite under 35 USC 112. In particular, the Examiner alleged that claims 11-20 are mis-descriptive. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Office Action alleges that only voltage controlled oscillator(s) selected by a state machine for calibration will be used in a frequency locked loop and subsequently controlled by an accumulator output (See Office Action, page 2).

Although the Examiner reading of Applicants' specification appears correct, Applicants claims 11-20 are directed to the facet of Applicants invention of tightening a tolerance band between a plurality of voltage controlled oscillators. Thus, claims 11-20 accurately recite features need to tightening a tolerance band between a plurality of voltage controlled oscillators and are NOT directed to selection of which of the plurality of voltage controlled oscillators tighten a tolerance band for.

Moreover, the Examiner alleged that the frequency locked loop that compares a frequency output from any of a plurality of voltage controlled oscillators to a reference frequency actually refers to a frequency discriminator or

comparator and not to the frequency locked loop itself (See Office Action, page 3).

Claims 11-20 are amended herein to recite "a frequency locked calibration loop" to clarify that the recited frequency locked loop includes calibration components, i.e., such as a comparator.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 11-20 are now in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 11-20 under 35 USC 112 be withdrawn.

**Claims 1 and 2 over Kenney**

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,803,827 to Kenney et al. ("Kenney"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is amended herein to recite limitations from now canceled claim 4 that was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. The Applicants respectfully request an indication that claim 1 is now allowed.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1 and 2 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

William H. Bollman  
Reg. No.: 36,457  
Tel. (202) 261-1020  
Fax. (202) 887-0336

**MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC**  
2000 M Street, N.W. 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington D.C. 20036-3307  
WHB/df